

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 are amended. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Swearingen at the interview held April 23, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. Amendments

By this Amendment, the independent claims are amended for clarity. All the features changed by the amendments were previously present in the claims. Thus, no new search or consideration is required.

II. The Claims Satisfy 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being "replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors." The Office Action further states that the claims are interpreted as a "network monitoring and alarm system."

The Office Action fails to cite any alleged instances of grammatical or idiomatic errors. Thus, a proper rejection has not been promulgated by the Office Action and Applicants are unable to know what specific wording is objected to. Applicants, as explained during the personal interview, respectfully submit that the claims are clear. Further, by this Amendment, the claims are amended to be even more clear. The Examiner is specifically requested to point out any grammar or idiomatic English use issues in the claims so that Applicants have an opportunity to respond.

Applicants note that the current claims do not recite the term "alarm." Thus, Applicants are at a loss as to why the Examiner indicates the claims are interpreted as a

"network monitoring and alarm system." As evidenced by the plain language of the claims, the claimed subject matter is directed to a service processing apparatus and method that differentiate between authenticated and non-authenticated users and cooperatively processes the document data by plural service processes or plural service processing apparatuses.

III. The Claims are Patentable over the Applied References

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,704,874 to Porras et al. (Porras). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

(1) Regarding independent claims 1 and 7, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "an instruction selection screen for displaying a list of available instructions for a non-authenticated user and for displaying a list of executable instructions for an authenticated user, wherein the list of available instructions includes non-executable instructions for the non-authenticated user". Regarding independent claims 4, 10 and 16, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "displaying a list of available instructions for a non-authenticated user; displaying a list of executable instructions for an authenticated user, wherein the list of available instructions includes non-executable instructions for the non-authenticated user". Regarding independent claim 13, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "an instruction selection screen for displaying instructions for a non-authenticated user and for displaying a list of executable instructions for an authenticated user, wherein the list of available instructions includes non-executable instructions for the non-authenticated user".

(2) Regarding independent claims 1, 7 and 13, Porras fails to disclose "a storing unit in which are stored (a) instruction data identifying a location of document data to be processed and identifying a content of plural service processes to be executed on the document data and (b) a correspondence relation between the instruction data that is to be processed when a specific event occurs and the specific event, wherein the plural service processes include at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving

facsimiles and image processing". Regarding independent claims 4, 10 and 16, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "identifying, when the notification that the specific event has occurred is given by at least one of the plural service processing apparatuses, instruction data that corresponds to the specific event based on the notification that the specific event has occurred, the instruction data including at least a location of document data to be processed and including a content of plural service processes to be executed on the document data, the identification of the instruction data being made on the basis of a correspondence relation between the specific event and the instruction data that is to be processed when the specific event occurs, wherein the instruction data includes at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles and image processing".

(3) Regarding independent claim 1, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "a cooperative processing unit that makes the plural service processing apparatuses cooperatively execute the plural service processes on the document data on the basis of the interpretation of the instruction data of the interpreting unit". Regarding independent claim 4, Porras fails to disclose "making the plural service processing apparatuses cooperatively execute the plural service processes on the document data on the basis of the interpreting step". Regarding independent claim 7, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "a sending unit that sends the instruction data identified by the identifying unit to a cooperative processing apparatus that cooperatively executes the plural service processes on the document data". Regarding independent claim 10, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "sending the identified instruction data to a cooperative processing apparatus that cooperatively executes the plural service processes on the document data". Regarding independent claim 13, Porras fails to disclose or suggest "a sending unit that sends the instruction data identified by the identifying unit to another service processing apparatus that conducts a service process on the document data described in the instruction data". Regarding independent claim 16, Porras fails to disclose or

suggest "sending the instruction data identified by the identifying step to another service processing apparatus that conducts a service process on the document data described in the instruction data".

Porras discloses a network based alert management system 10 (Fig. 1) that manages alarms generated from computer intrusions. Each user has a priority profile (col. 5, lines 3-10). In an embodiment, a default priority profile is generated for each user of the alert management system 10, which the user can modify to change the priority assignments (col. 5, lines 3-10).

Regarding the features quoted under (1) above, Examiner Swearingen stated during the personal interview that he did not understand these features. These features are discussed, for example, in the paragraph beginning on page 14, line 16 of the specification as filed.

Porras fails to disclose or suggest the features quoted above under (1) because, while the Office Action cites to col. 5, lines 3-10 as allegedly disclosing these features, the cited section does not disclose the features quoted above. The cited section discloses that each user begins with a default profile and can individually customize the profile to change the default values relating to alarms (see col. 4, lines 32-40). Thus, what situations are reported to the user can be controlled by the user. The cited section does not disclose the quoted features because (1) Porras is silent as to any explicit disclosure that users are treated differently depending on whether they are authenticated or not; (2) presumably, each user must be known to Porras (i.e., authenticated) so that the system of Porras can know which profile to use, thus there is no user that is provided with instructions available to all users without the user being authenticated; and (3) because each user is disclosed as receiving, initially, the same default profile, Porras is disclosing that all users (even if authenticated) are presented with the same profile, not profiles that are limited by user authorization as claimed.

Porras fails to disclose or suggest the features quoted above under (2) because, while the Office Action cites at col. 5, line 63 - col. 6, line 32, as disclosing these features, the cited section discloses that internal reports of alarms are used to generate incident reports (Fig. 2, step 62; col. 5, lines 63-64). The individual internal reports are examined for any of various parameters to determine if the report can be aggregated with other internal reports (col. 6, lines 13-18). The internal reports and incident reports do not include instructions because they are not used to control further processing. Further, the cited section, and the aggregated incident reports disclosed therein, do not disclose instruction data describing a location of document data, instruction data disclosing a content of plural service processing to be executed, corresponding relations between instruction data that is to be processed when a specific event occurs and the specific event, or wherein the instruction data includes at least one of copying, printing, scanning, sending facsimiles, receiving facsimiles, and image processing.

Porras fails to disclose or suggest the features quoted above under (3) because, while the Office Action cites to col. 6, lines 19-32 as disclosing these features, the cited section discloses the generation of the incident report. However, Porras fails to disclose that any of the processing utilized to produce the incident report is a service process described in instruction data, as claimed. Further, the Office Action, as discussed above, appears to assert that the internal reports correspond to the instruction data. However, Porras fails to disclose that the internal reports include any indication of service processes that are to be performed upon the occurrence of any events.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/rle

Date: April 28, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461